



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the large clothiers of the west of England. The emphasis upon the putting out of work by a capitalist employer would have forced him to distinguish between the craft work of the small master and the capitalistic system that grew up with the progress of the division of labor. The growth is sketched in some detail in connection with the description of conditions at the close of the eighteenth century, but the distinction between craft industry and the putting-out system is denied in an earlier passage. The value of the text is not impaired by this slight confusion in terminology, but an opportunity was lost. Careful attention to terms might have done much towards a clarification of English usage in a matter that is of great moment in the presentation of industrial history.

ABBOTT PAYSON USHER.

Boston University, College of Business Administration.

The Enclosure and Redistribution of Our Land. By W. H. R. CURTLER. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1920. Pp. viii, 334.)

The general reader of English economic history will welcome this volume as a much needed complement to *A Short History of English Agriculture*, by the same author, for in the earlier volume the reader is likely to feel the need of a more complete account of the peculiarities of English land tenure as a background for an understanding of the historical development of English agriculture. There is a certain amount of overlapping in the two volumes, more especially with regard to land tenure. Likewise, from the standpoint of the general reader, Professor Curtler's new book may fill the need for a continuous history of English land tenure from the early Saxon period to and including the Small Holdings and Allotment act of 1908. Teachers of economic history will find the book useful for supplementary reading because of the clarity of style and the care with which the author has either avoided technicalities or has made them clear to the general reader by careful definition—a most welcome characteristic to many American readers when first encountering the intricacies of English land tenure.

However, from the standpoint of the technical student, the book is not and does not purport to be a complete and continuous history of English land tenure. The central theme, as suggested by the title, is, on the one hand, the processes of enclosure and engrossment and, on the other hand, the movements and policies designed to modify the effects of these earlier processes by redistributing the land.

As introductory to the history of the enclosure movement, the author devotes seven chapters to a description of the manorial system and the common field system as existing before modified by enclosure and other changes.

In this portion of the book, the author does not pretend to break new ground. In the preface he states: "In the early part I have, in order to present a consecutive story, trodden well worn ground, and where Vinogradoff, Maitland, Ashley, Seeborn, Slater, Gonner, Tawney, Gray [H. L.], and others have worked there is little that is fresh to be discovered. I have, therefore, relied largely on their guidance, which is freely acknowledged in the text."

The general reader will appreciate this summary of the latest results of research in this difficult field and particularly the pains the author has taken to clarify the subject by careful definitions. Sometimes this very clarity leads the author to indulge in doubtful generalizations. Among these may be noted the statement on page 2, "Enclosure and the consolidation of holdings was unanimously desired and no sign of opposition was evinced," although plenty of evidence of such opposition both on the part of persons affected and on the part of contemporary writers on the common field system is presented in other portions of the book. Also questionable is the statement on page 23: "We may, perhaps, look on the *gafol gelder*, the *geneat*, and the *gebur* as the representatives of the *ceorls* of Æthelbert's laws; the former having maintained his position, the second deteriorated somewhat, and the third deteriorated to a greater extent." It may be asked whether it is not probable that *laetmen* of Æthelbert's time were, to a considerable extent, the prototypes of the *geburs*?

The second main division of the book, including two thirds of the total number of pages, is devoted to the history of the enclosure movement from the early pre-Tudor instances of consolidation to the close of the nineteenth century. So far as the Tudor enclosure movement is concerned, the writer has relied on the results of researches by Tawney, H. L. Gray, Gonner, Slater, Gay, Johnson, and others. One gets the impression, however, that the author is acquainted with the sources, which he has drawn on freely for illustrative material. In the study of the later enclosure movement, particularly the parliamentary enclosures, he has entered a much less thoroughly explored territory and the 125 pages devoted to this period gives evidence of intensive research. The author's real contributions on the subject consist in his detailed description of the *modus operandi* of enclosure both under the private acts and under the general acts of Parliament and in his critical discussion of the effects of enclosure and of the responsibility of the landlord class for the movement.

The discussion of the methods of bringing about enclosure is simplified by a classification of the kinds of enclosure and the methods of enclosure (pp. 81-83). The description of enclosure by private acts gives the impression that the movement, in spite of its abuses, was a

systematic program of land utilization and community planning, based on a careful land classification and survey. Considerable foresight was exercised in planning public roads, setting aside quarries for the improvement of the roads, and at a later time providing recreation grounds and other public utilities. The private acts are by no means a series of isolated and unrelated policies, but as early as 1760 had attained a fairly regular form. The author discusses in detail the expense of enclosure. He concludes that the direct expenses averaged about £1 per acre, but the indirect expenses, such as interior fencing, readjustment of buildings, and construction of private roads and drains were much heavier. In short, the indirect expenses probably amounted frequently to ten times the direct expenses. The poorer farmers without suitable credit were compelled in large numbers to relinquish their allotments through inability to finance the expense of enclosure, even though the increase in some of the holdings resulting therefrom was usually much greater than the expense. In reading the account one is inclined to regret that the enclosure acts were not supplemented by some system of public credit for refunding the expenses falling to the share of the small holders. As to the equity of the process of enclosure by private act, the author concludes, "In spite of some favoritism, there is no reason to think that the commissioners behaved with the partiality often attributed to them and on the whole they did their work honestly and impartially" (p. 159).

The author's attitude toward enclosures, and indeed toward allotments and small holdings, must be gauged in part by his evident "softness" toward the large landlord class. Many passages in the book reflect his impatience of the prevalent modern tendency to blame this class with the economic ills of England. It would be possible, if space permitted, to cite many passages which reflect this attitude. A single passage may be quoted for illustration: "Few will have sympathy with those who represent English landlords as engaged in a long sustained Machiavellian plot to deprive the poor man of his land, for such a charge shows ignorance both of history and of the character of Englishmen but the sin of ignoring the moral claims of the poor on enclosure, must on the whole be laid to their charge" (p. 245). In view, however, of the author's admission in the latter part of the quotation and of other admissions that landlords employed high handed methods, albeit commonly by legal procedure, that they were for the most part, prime movers in the process and that they were largely moved by economic self interest, it is difficult to see that he has made out a favorable case, except probably to show that the process of enclosure far exceeded the disadvantages, however selfish may have been the impelling

motives, and that enclosure should not be charged with some of the evils commonly attributed to it.

On the question of the advantages and disadvantages of the enclosure movement, the author must be credited with many passages of well balanced discussion. In the first place he attempts to exonerate the enclosure movement from entire responsibility for the disappearance of small holders, recognizing that small holders (freeholders, copyholders, and tenants) were a numerous and a relatively important class at the beginning of the eighteenth century. He attributes the decline in their relative numbers to other causes as well as to enclosure, including the development of commercial and competitive agriculture, the over-valuation of land as a result of the desire of the newly rich to acquire the social prestige of estate ownership, the disappearance of cottage by-industries, and the doctrine of the profitableness of large-scale ownership which accompanied the predominance of grain farming. In fact, the author believes that had the present urban demand for dairy products, eggs, fruits, and vegetables existed during the period of rapid enclosure, a much larger number of small holdings probably would have survived.

As to the improvement in economic efficiency attributable to enclosure, the author makes a convincing case. He has also assembled significant data to show that the commons had become an anachronism. After the system of village control and regulation of the commons had passed away, the commons became a public nuisance—the refuge of the idle and criminal, the occasion of innumerable disputes, and altogether a wasteful method of using the land. In this case, the author makes bold to say that “opinions of most modern writers on the subject, who lament the loss of the commons, are engendered in the closet” (p. 224). However, it is admitted that many deserving persons suffered loss through enclosure of the commons, and particularly those who had a moral rather than a legal right to their use. “This is the great blot on the enclosure movement—the failure to make compensation for the moral loss suffered by the deserving commoners. Many of the best men of the day—Sinclair, Young, and others—urged that this should be done, and in a few cases it was done; but in the great majority it was not” (p. 245).

The discussion of the small holdings and allotments movement in the last four chapters is a sequel to the discussion of foreclosures: it is shown that as a means of mitigating the hardships incident to enclosure, many private landlords provided allotments for laborers. The author traces the beginning of this movement to the early part of the eighteenth century. By 1887 there were 749,309 working men in England and Wales who had allotments out of a total of about 850,000

agricultural laborers in the preceding year. While not all of those provided with allotments at that date were agricultural laborers, it is probable that a large proportion of the agricultural laborers of the country were not landless, and the author believes that this result had largely been accomplished by the voluntary action of large landowners. In fact, the allotment legislation from 1782 to 1887 had been generally incident to poor relief and on the whole unsuccessful.

For the most part, the author's attitude toward allotments is favorable, but he is extremely doubtful of the advantages of small holdings and particularly of the success of small holdings created by legislation. The success of small holdings in the days of Gregory King is attributable to the fact that agriculture was largely self sufficing and free from keen competition and to the advantage of by-industries. It is probable that the creation of small holdings by legislation implies in part a substitution of an uneconomical for an economical scale of organization. "Moreover, against the 'magic' of property is put the 'poison' of property—whereby a man is led to sacrifice everything, even his health, to his land and his crops" (p. 265 note). Supplementing the tendency of legislation for small holdings the author points to the marked tendency for landlords voluntarily to subdivide and sell their estates, which are largely being purchased by their tenants. More than one third of the land of England had thus changed hands in the ten years preceding 1919. In these ways the results of the enclosure and engrossment processes are being reversed.

LEWIS C. GRAY.

NEW BOOKS

BACHI, R. *L'Italia economica nel 1919*. Anno XI. (Milan: Soc. Ed. Dante Alighieri. 1920. Pp. xii, 476).

The first year of peace in Italy, hailed as a year likely to restore at least the semblance of pre-war conditions, was an epoch of grave disorders. Inflation of the currency was at once the effect and the cause of profound trouble. The latest edition of Bachi's annual follows the course of these changes and indicates the specific forms they took in matters of trade, banking, prices, production, labor, transportation and public finance, together with the activities of the various classes of association (industrial, labor, etc.) of the nation. A feature new with the current volume is a considerable section dealing with the economic conditions and problems of Julian Venetia.

R. F. FOERSTER.

BAKER, C. W. *Government control and operation of industry in Great Britain and the United States during the world war*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Preliminary economic studies of the war, no. 18. (New York: Oxford Univ. Press. 1921. Pp. v, 138.)

BLICKLE, K. *China, Wirtschaft und Wirtschaftsgrundlagen*. (Berlin: Vereinigung Wissensch. Verlger. 1921. 36 M.)